



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,880	02/27/2002	Nina Lewis	OID 2000-083-01	7239
55498	7590	02/01/2010	EXAMINER	
ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION			GANDHII, DIPAKKUMAR B	
c/o VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1885 LUNDY AVENUE				2117
SUITE 108				
San Jose, CA 95131				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
02/01/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/084,880	Applicant(s) LEWIS, NINA
	Examiner DIPAKKUMAR GANDHI	Art Unit 2117

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-24, 26-42 and 44-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-24, 26-42 and 44-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2117

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 11/23/2009 has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 12 of claim 1, "local database network" is incorrect. It should be --local database network node--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1, 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Bains et al. (US 5579222).

As per claim 1, Cohen et al. teach a computer-implemented method for managing user access information for access to one or more database network nodes, the method comprising: storing database user authentication information; receiving an access request from the user for the local database network node; authenticating the user based at least in part upon the database user authentication information (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 35-45, lines 61-67, col. 5, lines 16-40, Cohen et al.).

Art Unit: 2117

However Cohen et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of storing database user authorization in a central directory that is associated with one or more network nodes, the database user authorization comprising a user role, wherein the database user authorization is stored as one or more data objects in the central directory; receiving the user role at a local database network node from the central directory; the user role that is from the central directory, and the local policy has a different scope of access than another local policy defined by processing the same user role determined at another local database network; granting the user privileges on the local database network node based at least in part upon the local policy; and storing the user privileges in a volatile or non-volatile computer-usuable medium or displaying the user privileges on a display device.

Moriconi et al. in an analogous art teach a system that combines a centrally managed policy database with distributed authorization (access control) services that enforce the policy for all applications across the organization (col. 3, lines 63-67, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al teach that the system comprises a policy manager located on a server...local client policy (col. 4, lines 19-30, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al. teach that an authorization...directory servers (col. 6, line 33 - col. 7, line 11, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al teach that user of an object...the rule does not evaluate to "false" (col. 7, lines 25 - col. 8, line 31, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al. teach that referring now to FIG. 3, a block diagram of one embodiment for non-volatile memory 138, located within client 116 of FIG. 1, is shown. In the FIG. 3 embodiment, non-volatile memory 138 preferably includes an application guard 310 that grants or denies access to various components of client 116, as specified by a pre-determined policy. For example, various components of client 116 can include applications, data, and/or objects. In the FIG. 3 embodiment, application guard 310 preferably includes at least one application 312, an authorization library program 314, an authorization engine program 316, and a local client policy 318 (fig. 3, col. 9, lines 10-20, Moriconi).

Moriconi et al. also teach that local administrative policy 228 provides a set of policy rules specifying which users are authorized to access management station 212 (fig. 4, col. 9, lines 57-60, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al. teach that since the application guards 310 can be distributed among various clients 116, and each application guard 310 has its own specific local client policy 318 (col. 10, lines 18-20, Moriconi

Art Unit: 2117

et al.). Moriconi et al. teach that referring now to FIG. 9, a flowchart of one embodiment of menu option navigate tree 814 in management station 212 is shown. Navigate tree 814 provides a set of options for an administrator to add, delete, and/or modify features on server 112 or client 116. The features that an administrator may add, delete, and/or modify include global users 910, global roles 912, directories 914, local roles 916, local users 918, applications 920, application guards 922, and declarations 924. At step 926, the system administrator may then exit from navigate tree 814 (fig. 9, col. 12, lines 31-40, Moriconi et al.).

Moriconi et al. teach that each application guard 310 has its own specific local client policy 318 (col. 10, lines 20-21, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al. teach that application guard interface 512 can be located on a client computer, while authorization engine 316 and local client policy 318 can be located on a client server (col. 11, lines 14-17, Moriconi et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Moriconi et al. by including an additional step of storing database user authorization in a central directory that is associated with one or more network nodes, the database user authorization comprising a user role, wherein the database user authorization is stored as one or more data objects in the central directory; receiving the user role at a local database network node from the central directory; locally defining by a processor a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined determined by processing at the local database network node the user role that is from the central directory, and the local policy has a different scope of access than another local policy defined by processing the same user role determined at another local database network; granting the user privileges on the local database network node based at least in part upon the local policy; and storing the user privileges in a volatile or non-volatile computer-readable medium or displaying the user privileges on a display device.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to provide more security in protecting the data using different roles for different users.

Art Unit: 2117

Cohen et al. also do not explicitly teach the specific use of locally defining by using a processor a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined determined by processing at the local database network node.

However Bains et al. in an analogous art teach that the improvement, in one embodiment, to the system includes a policy server database maintained on each node, containing data specifying conditions under which usage of the software product is permitted on the corresponding node and license policy maintained at the local node (abstract, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that each computer node 11 of the network may be running a variety of software products, such as PDS (item 12a), EMS (item 12b), and so forth (shown through item 12j). Each of these products includes a call "get.sub.-- license" to the local policy server daemon 16 for a determination whether a license is available to run the product in question (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 30-35, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that the local policy server daemon 16 operates at the computer node 11 and makes the permission-to-run availability determination by reference to its associated policy server database 14, also located at the node, to identify the rules specifying the circumstances under which a license would be granted (col. 5, lines 39-44, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that the policy server database file 14 of a computer node stores the license requirements for each software product to be run at that node. For each software product, the database may identify the number of base license "tokens" and version license "tokens" obtained from the server running the Licensing System, that are necessary for operation of that software product on the particular computer constituting the node. (The particular computer, for example, may be particularly fast in processing, and therefore a higher license fee may be required for running the software product on such computer, resulting here in a larger number of tokens required for the base and version licenses.), col. 6, lines 48-59, Bains et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Bains et al. by including an additional step of locally defining by using a processor a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined determined by processing at the local database network node.

Art Unit: 2117

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to provide user privileges at each local node independently.

U.S. Patent

Nov. 26, 1996

Sheet 1 of 9

5,579,222




FIG.1

- As per claim 54, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al. and Bains et al. teach the additional limitations.

Moriconi et al. teach the method, wherein the one or more privileges are locally defined at

the one of the network nodes (col. 3, lines 63-67, col. 4, lines 19-30, Moriconi et al.).

- As per claim 55, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al. and Bains et al. teach the additional limitations.

Moriconi et al. teach the method, wherein the database user authorization is stored in the central directory such that central management of the user role may be performed (col. 6, line 33 - col. 7, line 11, Moriconi et al.).

- As per claim 56, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al. and Bains et al. teach the additional limitations.

Moriconi et al. teach the method, wherein the one or more privileges are not centrally defined at the central directory (col. 3, lines 63-67, col. 4, lines 34-48, Moriconi et al.).

7. Claims 2-4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Bains et al. (US 5579222) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1).

As per claim 2, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al. and Bains et al. substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 1 (as rejected above).

However Cohen et al., Moriconi et al. and Bains et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of an LDAP-compatible directory.

Ferguson et al. in an analogous art teach that this is accomplished by user authentication via a lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) server that authenticates users within particular domain names that map to specific customer accounts (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Ferguson et al. by including an additional step of using an LDAP-compatible directory.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using an LDAP-compatible

Art Unit: 2117

directory would provide the opportunity to use a hierarchical structure for user authentication during login process.

- As per claim 3, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which the database user authentication information is stored at the central directory (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 4, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which the database user authorization is stored in a schema having a hierarchy of schema objects (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 11, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which the one or more objects are stored in a security subtree in the central directory (figure 1, page 3, paragraph 36, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 12, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which administrative access is controlled to one or more data objects in the central directory (page 25, paragraph 196, Ferguson et al.)

- As per claim 13, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which access control is implemented using an access control point associated with the one or more data objects in the central directory (page 19, paragraph 150, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 14, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2117

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which the access control point is associated with access policies for a subtree of the one or more database objects in the central directory (page 19, paragraph 145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 15, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which the access control point is associated with access policies for a single entry for the one or more database objects in the central directory (page 19, paragraph 145, Ferguson et al.).

Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 16, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which the access control point is associated with individually named users (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 17, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which the access control point is associated with a group of users (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 18, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the method in which members of the group are associated with a set of access privileges associated with the access control point (page 19, paragraph 145, 152, Ferguson et al.).

8. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010), Bains et al. (US 5579222) and Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Gavrilov et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1).

As per claim 5, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 4 (as rejected above).

Art Unit: 2117

However Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Ferguson et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of the method in which the hierarchy of schema objects comprises an enterprise role, wherein the enterprise role is associated with one or more users and one or more locally defined roles.

Gavrila et al. in an analogous art teach that this invention makes use, in yet a further aspect, of both local and global groups for the instantiation of roles on multiple computer hosts, to implement nested groups and to enable the integration of extant host computers, which include local user accounts and groups defined on independent servers and workstations, within large distributed operating systems (abstract, Gavrila et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Gavrila et al by including an additional step of using the method in which the hierarchy of schema objects comprises an enterprise role, wherein the enterprise role is associated with one or more users and one or more locally defined roles.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to define a global role to associate the users with the authorization to access local databases.

- As per claim 6, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach that the privileges associated with the one or more locally defined roles are assigned to the one or more users (abstract, page 3, paragraph 22, Gavrila et al.).

- As per claim 7, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach the method in which the hierarchy of schema objects comprises an enterprise domain, wherein the enterprise domain comprises one or more enterprise roles (page 2, paragraph 10, Gavrila et al.).

- As per claim 8, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2117

Gavrila et al. teach the method in which each of the one or more enterprise roles is associated with one or more users and one or more locally defined roles (abstract, Gavrila et al.).

- As per claim 9, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Ferguson et al., Bains et al., and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach the method in which the enterprise domain is associated with one or more network nodes (page 3, paragraph 22, Gavrila et al.).

9. Claims 19-24, 26-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010), Bains et al. (US 5579222), Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1) and Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1).

As per claim 19, Cohen et al. teach a computer system including a processor for managing user access information for one or more database network nodes, comprising: one or more local database network nodes for which user access is sought; and the user access information data objects comprising authentication (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 35-45, lines 61-67, col. 5, lines 16-40, col. 18, lines 6-8, Cohen et al.). However Cohen et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of a LDAP directory; wherein the one or more local database network nodes are associated with the LDAP directory; a volatile or non-volatile computer-readable medium for storing user access information data objects in the LDAP directory.

Ferguson et al. in an analogous art teach that this database 302 may be accessed by the various agents 304A, 304B, 304C, whose level of access may be determined by a hierarchy of trust component 306. This is accomplished by user authentication via a lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) server that authenticates users within particular domain names that map to specific customer accounts. The hierarchy of trust component 306 interprets the data related to it from the database 302, and communicates this data, or the interpretation thereof to the various agents 304A, 304B, 304C, and/or the user interface 308 (figure 3, page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Ferguson et al. by including an additional step of using a LDAP directory; wherein the one or more local database network nodes are associated

Art Unit: 2117

with the LDAP directory; a volatile or non-volatile computer-usable medium for storing user access information data objects in the LDAP directory.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to use a hierarchical structure for user authentication during login process.

Cohen et al. also do not explicitly teach the specific use of the user access information data objects comprising authorization information wherein the authorization information is associated with a scope of access for a user and the local policy has a different scope of access than another local policy at another local database network node.

However Moriconi et al. in an analogous art teach a system that combines a centrally managed policy database with distributed authorization (access control) services that enforce the policy for all applications across the organization (col. 3, lines 63-67, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al teach that the system comprises a policy manager located on a server...local client policy (col. 4, lines 19-30, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al. teach that an authorization...directory servers (col. 6, line 33 - col. 7, line 11, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al teach that user of an object...the rule does not evaluate to "false" (col. 7, lines 25 – col. 8, line 31, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi teaches that referring now to FIG. 3, a block diagram of one embodiment for non-volatile memory 138, located within client 116 of FIG. 1, is shown. In the FIG. 3 embodiment, non-volatile memory 138 preferably includes an application guard 310 that grants or denies access to various components of client 116, as specified by a pre-determined policy. For example, various components of client 116 can include applications, data, and/or objects. In the FIG. 3 embodiment, application guard 310 preferably includes at least one application 312, an authorization library program 314, an authorization engine program 316, and a local client policy 318 (fig. 3, col. 9, lines 10-20, Moriconi). Moriconi et al. also teach that local administrative policy 228 provides a set of policy rules specifying which users are authorized to access management station 212 (fig. 4, col. 9, lines 57-60, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi teaches that since the application guards 310 can be distributed among various clients 116, and each application guard 310 has its own specific local client policy 318 (col. 10, lines 18-20, Moriconi). Moriconi teaches that referring now to FIG. 9, a flowchart of one embodiment of menu

Art Unit: 2117

option navigate tree 814 in management station 212 is shown. Navigate tree 814 provides a set of options for an administrator to add, delete, and/or modify features on server 112 or client 116. The features that an administrator may add, delete, and/or modify include global users 910, global roles 912, directories 914, local roles 916, local users 918, applications 920, application guards 922, and declarations 924. At step 926, the system administrator may then exit from navigate tree 814 (fig. 9, col. 12, lines 31-40, Moriconi).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Moriconi et al. by including an additional step of using the user access information data objects comprising authorization information wherein the authorization information is associated with a scope of access for a user, wherein the local policy is locally defined by processing at the local database network node, and the processor for locally defining a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node and the local policy has a different scope of access than another local policy at another local database network node.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to provide more security in protecting the data using scope of access for different users.

Cohen et al. also do not explicitly teach specifically an enterprise role that is received from the central directory.

However Gavrilova et al. in an analogous art teach local and global groups for the instantiation of roles on multiple computer hosts (abstract, Gavrilova et al.). Gavrilova et al. also teach role instances of a role on a host computer or set of host computers...both instances were derived on the same set of host computers (page 3, paragraph 22, Gavrilova et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Gavrilova et al. by including an additional step of using an enterprise role that is received from the central directory.

Art Unit: 2117

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to define a global role to associate the users with the authorization to access local databases.

Cohen et al. also do not explicitly teach specifically the processor for locally defining a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined by processing at the local database network node.

However Bains et al. in an analogous art teach that the improvement, in one embodiment, to the system includes a policy server database maintained on each node, containing data specifying conditions under which usage of the software product is permitted on the corresponding node and license policy maintained at the local node (abstract, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that each computer node 11 of the network may be running a variety of software products, such as PDS (item 12a), EMS (item 12b), and so forth (shown through item 12j). Each of these products includes a call "get.sub.-- license" to the local policy server daemon 16 for a determination whether a license is available to run the product in question (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 30-35, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that the local policy server daemon 16 operates at the computer node 11 and makes the permission-to-run availability determination by reference to its associated policy server database 14, also located at the node, to identify the rules specifying the circumstances under which a license would be granted (col. 5, lines 39-44, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that the policy server database file 14 of a computer node stores the license requirements for each software product to be run at that node. For each software product, the database may identify the number of base license "tokens" and version license "tokens" obtained from the server running the Licensing System, that are necessary for operation of that software product on the particular computer constituting the node. (The particular computer, for example, may be particularly fast in processing, and therefore a higher license fee may be required for running the software product on such computer, resulting here in a larger number of tokens required for the base and version licenses.), col. 6, lines 48-59, Bains et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Bains et al. by including additionally the

Art Unit: 2117

processor for locally defining a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined by processing at the local database network node.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to provide user privileges at each local node independently.

- As per claim 20, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach the system in which the user access information data objects comprise a domain object that is associated with the one or more database network nodes (page 8, paragraph 98-99, Gavrila et al.).

- As per claim 21, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach the system in which the domain object is associated with the enterprise role (page 8, paragraph 99, Gavrila et al.).

- As per claim 22, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach the system in which the enterprise role is associated with a local database role (abstract, page 3, paragraph 22, Gavrila et al.).

- As per claim 23, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach the system in which the scope of the local database role is locally defined at a local database network node (page 3, paragraph 22, Gavrila et al.).

Ferguson et al. teach database (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 24, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2117

Gavrila et al. teach the system in which the enterprise role is associated with another user (page 3, paragraph 22, Gavrila et al.).

- As per claim 26, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the user access information data objects comprise an access control point attribute (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 27, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the access control point attribute is established only if access control policies are established for a corresponding object (page 19, paragraph 145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 28, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the access control point attribute is associated with access policies for a subtree in the user access information data objects stored in the LDAP directory (page 19, paragraph 145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 29, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the access control point attribute is associated with access policies for a single entry in the user access information data objects stored in the LDAP directory (page 19, paragraph 145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 30, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the access control point attribute is associated with individually named users (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 31, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2117

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the access control point attribute is associated with a group of users (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 32, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which members of the group are associated with a set of access privileges associated with the access control (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 33, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the user access information data objects comprise a mapping object that maps a database user to a database schema (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 34, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the mapping object affects a single user (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 35, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the mapping object is associated with a full distinguished name (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 36, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the mapping object is associated with a plurality of users (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 37, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach the system in which the mapping object is associated with a partial distinguished name (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

Art Unit: 2117

- As per claim 38, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Ferguson et al. and Gavrila et al. teach the additional limitations.

Gavrila et al. teach the system in which the enterprise role is associated with local database roles from a plurality of database nodes (abstract, Gavrila et al.).

10. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010), Bains et al. (US 5579222) and Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1).

As per claim 39, Cohen et al. teach a process for managing user access information for database network nodes, the process comprising: storing database user authentication information; receiving an access request from a user for the local database network node; authenticating the user based upon the database user authentication information (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 35-45, lines 61-67, col. 5, lines 16-40, Cohen et al.).

However Cohen et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of storing database user authorization in a central directory that is associated with one or more network nodes, the database user authorization comprising a user role, wherein the database user authorization is stored as one or more data objects in the central directory; storing database user authentication information; receiving the user role at a local database network node from the central directory; the user role that is from the central directory, and the local policy has a different scope of access than another local policy defined by processing the same user role at another local database network node; granting the user privileges on the local database network node based upon the local policy; and storing the user privileges or displaying the user privileges on a display device.

Moriconi et al. in an analogous art teach a system that combines a centrally managed policy database with distributed authorization (access control) services that enforce the policy for all applications across the organization (col. 3, lines 63-67, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al teach that the system comprises a policy manager located on a server..local client policy (col. 4, lines 19-30, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al teach that an authorization...directory servers (col. 6, line 33 - col. 7, line 11, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi et al teach that user of an object...the rule does not evaluate to "false" (col. 7, lines 25 – col. 8, line 31,

Art Unit: 2117

Moriconi et al.). Moriconi teaches that referring now to FIG. 3, a block diagram of one embodiment for non-volatile memory 138, located within client 116 of FIG. 1, is shown. In the FIG. 3 embodiment, non-volatile memory 138 preferably includes an application guard 310 that grants or denies access to various components of client 116, as specified by a pre-determined policy. For example, various components of client 116 can include applications, data, and/or objects. In the FIG. 3 embodiment, application guard 310 preferably includes at least one application 312, an authorization library program 314, an authorization engine program 316, and a local client policy 318 (fig. 3, col. 9, lines 10-20, Moriconi). Moriconi et al. also teach that local administrative policy 228 provides a set of policy rules specifying which users are authorized to access management station 212 (fig. 4, col. 9, lines 57-60, Moriconi et al.). Moriconi teaches that since the application guards 310 can be distributed among various clients 116, and each application guard 310 has its own specific local client policy 318 (col. 10, lines 18-20, Moriconi). Moriconi teaches that referring now to FIG. 9, a flowchart of one embodiment of menu option navigate tree 814 in management station 212 is shown. Navigate tree 814 provides a set of options for an administrator to add, delete, and/or modify features on server 112 or client 116. The features that an administrator may add, delete, and/or modify include global users 910, global roles 912, directories 914, local roles 916, local users 918, applications 920, application guards 922, and declarations 924. At step 926, the system administrator may then exit from navigate tree 814 (fig. 9, col. 12, lines 31-40, Moriconi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Moriconi et al. by including an additional step of storing database user authorization in a central directory that is associated with one or more network nodes, the database user authorization comprising a user role, wherein the database user authorization is stored as one or more data objects in the central directory; storing database user authentication information; receiving the user role at a local database network node from the central directory; locally defining a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined by processing at the local database network node the user role that is from the central directory, and the local policy has a different scope of access than another local policy defined by processing the same user role at another local database network node;

Art Unit: 2117

granting the user privileges on the local database network node based upon the local policy; and storing the user privileges or displaying the user privileges on a display device.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to provide more security in protecting the data using different roles for different users.

Cohen et al. also do not explicitly teach the specific use of a computer program product that includes a volatile or non-volatile computer-readable medium usable by a processor, the medium having stored thereon a sequence of instructions which, when executed by said processor, causes said processor to execute a process for the process comprising:

However Gavrila et al. in an analogous art teach a computer program product containing computer readable code for causing a machine to perform the method (page 19, claim 22, Gavrila et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Gavrila et al. by including an additional step of using a computer program product that includes a volatile or non-volatile computer-readable medium usable by a processor, the medium having stored thereon a sequence of instructions which, when executed by said processor, causes said processor to execute a process.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using a computer program product that includes a medium usable by a processor, the medium having stored thereon a sequence of instructions which, when executed by said processor, causes said processor to execute a process would provide the opportunity to execute the process automated, faster and accurately.

Cohen et al. also do not explicitly teach the specific use of locally defining a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined by processing at the local database network node.

However Bains et al. in an analogous art teach that the improvement, in one embodiment, to the system includes a policy server database maintained on each node, containing data specifying conditions under which usage of the software product is permitted on the corresponding node and license policy

Art Unit: 2117

maintained at the local node (abstract, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that each computer node 11 of the network may be running a variety of software products, such as PDS (item 12a), EMS (item 12b), and so forth (shown through item 12j). Each of these products includes a call "get.sub.- license" to the local policy server daemon 16 for a determination whether a license is available to run the product in question (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 30-35, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that the local policy server daemon 16 operates at the computer node 11 and makes the permission-to-run availability determination by reference to its associated policy server database 14, also located at the node, to identify the rules specifying the circumstances under which a license would be granted (col. 5, lines 39-44, Bains et al.). Bains et al. teach that the policy server database file 14 of a computer node stores the license requirements for each software product to be run at that node. For each software product, the database may identify the number of base license "tokens" and version license "tokens" obtained from the server running the Licensing System, that are necessary for operation of that software product on the particular computer constituting the node. (The particular computer, for example, may be particularly fast in processing, and therefore a higher license fee may be required for running the software product on such computer, resulting here in a larger number of tokens required for the base and version licenses.), col. 6, lines 48-59, Bains et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Bains et al. by including an additional step of locally defining a local policy comprising user privileges for a local scope of access at the local database network node, wherein the local policy is locally defined by processing at the local database network node.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to provide user privileges at each local node independently.

11. Claims 40-42, 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010), Bains et al. (US 5579222) and Gavrilov et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1) as applied to claim 39 above, and further in view of Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1).

Art Unit: 2117

As per claim 40, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Gavrila et al. substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 39 (as rejected above).

However Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Gavrila et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of the central directory comprising an LDAP-compatible directory.

Ferguson et al. in an analogous art teach that this is accomplished by user authentication via a lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) server that authenticates users within particular domain names that map to specific customer accounts (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Ferguson et al. by including an additional step of using the central directory comprising an LDAP-compatible directory.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that using the central directory comprising an LDAP-compatible directory would provide the opportunity to use a hierarchical structure for user authentication during login process.

- As per claim 41, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that the database user authentication information is stored at the central directory (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 42, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that the database user authorization is stored in a schema having a hierarchy of schema objects (page 4, paragraph 41, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 44, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that the one or more objects are stored in a security subtree in the central directory (figure 1, page 3, paragraph 36, Ferguson et al.).

Art Unit: 2117

- As per claim 45, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that administrative access is controlled to one or more data objects in the central directory (page 25, paragraph 196, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 46, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that access control is implemented using an access control point associated with the one or more data objects in the central directory (page 19, paragraph 150, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 47, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that the access control point is associated with access policies for a subtree of the one or more database objects in the central directory (page 19, paragraph 145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 48, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that the access control point is associated with access policies for a single entry for the one or more database objects in the central directory (page 19, paragraph 145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 49, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that the access control point is associated with individually named users (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 50, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Ferguson et al. teach that the access control point is associated with a group of users (page 18-19, paragraph 144-145, Ferguson et al.).

- As per claim 51, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al., Gavrila et al. and Ferguson et al. teach the additional limitations.

Art Unit: 2117

Ferguson et al. teach that members of the group are associated with a set of access privileges associated with the access control point (page 19, paragraph 145, 152, Ferguson et al.).

12. Claims 52, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Bains et al. (US 5579222) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Franklin et al. (US 2001/0023440 A1).

As per claim 52, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al. and Bains et al. substantially teach the claimed invention described in claim 1 (as rejected above).

However Cohen et al., Moriconi et al. and Bains et al. do not explicitly teach the specific use of the method, wherein one of the one or more data objects comprises a distinguished name, wherein the distinguished name comprises a common name having a value for identifying a database.

Franklin et al. in an analogous art teach that a user object 98 is associated with an individual user. The distinguished name 144 of FIG. 6 is exemplary of all distinguished names 124. Each distinguished name 124 typically includes a common name 146 in association with a context 148. Context 148 may include acronyms, abbreviations, or other identifications of organizations, geography, logical relationships, and enterprises, as illustrated (fig. 5, 6, page 4, paragraph 53, Franklin et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Cohen et al.'s patent with the teachings of Franklin et al. by including the method, wherein one of the one or more data objects comprises a distinguished name, wherein the distinguished name comprises a common name having a value for identifying a database.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it would provide the opportunity to identify a database.

- As per claim 53, Cohen et al., Moriconi et al., Bains et al. and Franklin et al. teach the additional limitations.

Franklin et al. teach the method, wherein one of the one or more data objects comprises a distinguished name, wherein the distinguished name comprises a common name having a value for representing an

Art Unit: 2117

administrative context, a root context, or a user-defined context (fig. 5, 6, page 4, paragraph 53, Franklin et al.).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DIPAKKUMAR GANDHI whose telephone number is (571)272-3822. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Ellis can be reached on (571)272-4205. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DIPAKKUMAR GANDHI/
Examiner, Art Unit 2117

/Kevin L Ellis/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2117